



PATENT APPLICATION

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re the Application of

Akira TAKADA et al.

Group Art Unit: 2625

Application No.: 09/852,326

Examiner: S. Chawan

Filed: May 10, 2001

Docket No.: 109414

For: METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR GENERATING PART PROGRAMS FOR USE IN
IMAGE-MEASURING INSTRUMENTS, AND IMAGE-MEASURING INSTRUMENT
AND METHOD OF DISPLAYING MEASURED RESULTS THEREFROM

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

RECEIVED

AUG 30 2004

Technology Center 2600

Sir:

In reply to the May 27, 2004, Office Action, reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in light of the following remarks.

Claims 1-18 are pending in this application. Applicants appreciate the Office Action's indication that claims 7-9 contain allowable subject matter.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-6 and 10-18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over the document entitled "A Framework for Image Interpretation in Manufacturing Applications" by Marefat et al. ("Marefat") in view of U.S. Patent 5,590,060 to Granville et al ("Granville"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Office Action acknowledges that Marefat does not disclose or suggest a display means for graphically displaying work data. However, the Office Action asserts that Granville discloses this feature, and that it would have been obvious to combine the references in a manner that resulted in the claimed combination of features.

1. However, Applicants respectfully submit that, even if combined, Marefat and Granville do not disclose or suggest generating an edge detection tool corresponding to each selected graphic, and generating a part program containing an edge detection command by the generated edge detection tool, as recited, *inter alia*, in claims 1 and 11-13.

Marefat discloses interpreting an image based on prior knowledge of various objects that the subject image might possibly represent. More specifically, Marefat discloses taking an image of an object and then attempting to determine what the object is by attempting to match the image with pre-stored images. See, e.g., Fig. 1; page 569, the sixth paragraph; page 570, the seventh paragraph; and the example given in section 7 beginning on page 572.

Applicants respectfully submit that Marefat merely discloses interpreting an image, but does not disclose or suggest a part program with description of measurement procedures for measuring a work, as recited in claims 1 and 11-13. An interpretation merely provides an explanation of what the image represents. Marefat does not disclose or suggest making measurements of a work. Thus, Marefat does not disclose or suggest a part program with description of measurement procedures for measuring a work, much less generating an edge detection tool corresponding to selected graphic and generating a part program containing an edge detection command by the generated edge detection tool, as recited in claims 1 and 11-13.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that Marefat does not disclose or suggest reading a part program with description of measurement procedures, and executing the part program to obtain a measured result, as recited in claims 14 and 16-18.

As discussed above in connection with claims 1 and 11-13, Marefat merely discloses interpreting an image. Marefat does not disclose or suggest a part program with descriptions of measurement procedures, much less executing the part program to obtain a measured

result. Therefore, Marefat does not disclose or suggest the subject matter recited in claims 14 and 16-18.

Granville discloses an object measurement system for inspection and measurement of various objects so as to obtain information regarding their features, dimensional measurements and tolerances. See col. 2, lines 23-27. Granville does not disclose or suggest a part program with description of measurement procedures, generating an edge detection tool corresponding to selected graphic, and generating a part program containing an edge detection command by the generated edge detection tool, as recited in claims 1 and 11-13; or reading a part program with description of measurement procedures, and executing the part program to obtain measured result, as recited in claims 14 and 16-18. Therefore, Granville does not supply the subject matter lacking in Marefat. Thus, Marefat and Granville, even if combined, do not disclose or suggest the subject matter recited in claims 1, 11-14 and 16-18.

2. Additionally, Applicants respectfully submit that the alleged motivation to combine references is without merit. Specifically, the Office Action asserts that column 5, lines 33-35 of Granville would have motivated one of ordinary skill in the art to include in the Marefat apparatus a "display means for graphically displaying ... work data read by [an] input means." However, the passage at column 5, lines 33-35 of Granville assumes that it is already known what object is being inspected. This is in direct contrast to Marefat, in which the purpose of the apparatus is to find out what object is being inspected. In Marefat, there is simply no reason suggested for displaying anything until the system determines a match from among pre-stored images, and, at the end, displays one of those pre-stored images as a recognition result (see page 574, second full paragraph). Therefore, neither column 5, lines 33-35 nor any other passage of Granville would have motivated one of ordinary skill in the art to include "display means for graphically displaying ... work data read by [an] input means" in the Marefat apparatus.

Applicants additionally submit that claims 2-10 and 15 are each patentable over Marefat and Granville by virtue of their dependence on claims 1 and 14, respectively, as well as for additional features they recite.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection over Marefat in view of Granville be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-18 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Gang Luo
Registration No. 50,559

JAO:GXL/sqb

Date: August 26, 2004

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--